

REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action dated March 16, 2006. Applicant has amended claims 2, 5, 7, 8, and 10-12. Claims 2-12 are pending.

Claim 1 has been cancelled without prejudice.

Claim 2 has been amended to be rewritten in independent form by including the limitations of the original claim 1.

Claim 5 has been amended to correctly refer to an antecedent term by reciting "using said delegation object".

Similar amendments have been made in claim 7, claim 8 (step f)), claim 10 (step f)), claim 11 (step f)), and claim 12 (step f)), with reference to "said planning data repository".

Claims 7, 8, 10, and 11 have been amended to correct a typographical error.

The amendments to the claims are fully supported by the application as originally filed. No new matter has been introduced by way of the amendments.

Under paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 2-7 as being dependent on a rejected base claim. As discussed above, Applicant has rewritten claim 2 in independent form by including the limitations of the original claim 1. Claims 3-7 depend on claim 2.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-7 are in allowable state.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has cancelled claim 1 without prejudice

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by "Introduction to Database Systems", C J Date 7th edition 2000, Chapter 21, "Decision Support".

Applicant has cancelled claim 1 without prejudice.

Allowable Subject Matter

Under Paragraph 5 of the office action, the Examiner stated that claims 2-7 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Further, under Paragraph 5 of the office action, the Examiner acknowledged that claims 8-12 are allowed over the prior art of record.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-12 are patentable in view of the cited reference. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

In view of the above amendments and remarks and having dealt with all the objections raised by the Examiner, reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously requested.

CONCLUSION

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-12 are patentable in view of the cited reference. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection. In view of the above amendments and remarks and having dealt with all the objections raised by the Examiner, reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously requested.

Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to deposit account number 50-1778.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the below-signed attorney to discuss this application.

Date:

By:

July 13, 2005
SHUMAKER & SIEFFERT, P.A.
8425 Seasons Parkway, Suite 105
St. Paul, Minnesota 55125
Telephone: 651.735.1100
Facsimile: 651.735.1102

Kent J. Sieffert
Name: Kent J. Sieffert
Reg. No.: 41,312